

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7 and 9, all the claims pending in the application, stand rejected. Claims 1 and 6 are amended. New claim 10 is added. Claim 3 is cancelled.

The amendment of claims 1 and 6 is clearly supported by the description of page 6, lines 8-14 of the original specification. New claim 10 is clearly supported by the description of page 6, lines 22-25 of the instant specification.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

**Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Saito et al (6,782,717).** This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

As a preliminary matter, the rejection of claim 3 is moot in view of the cancellation of this claim. Also, applicants note that the Examiner's statement of rejection appears to erroneously mention claim 9 rather than claim 7 in the first instance.

### **Claims 1 and 6**

Independent claims 1 and 6 have been amended to add the further limitation that two tapes are used. According to the present invention, as now recited amended claims 1 and 6, the polishing step for imparting the texture is carried out by using a first tape. On the other hand, the cleaning step for cleaning the principal surface is carried out by using the second tape. In this case, the first tape is different from the second tape.

As described at page 6, lines 9-14 of the original specification, "use of a different tape enables a more uniform texture to be formed and is therefore preferable. This is because, to the tape which has been used in texturing, a slurry used in texturing and other foreign matters may be adhered. Therefore, it is preferable to prepare a different tape, i.e., a cleaning tape different from the tape for texturing and to carry out cleaning with the tape."

### **Saito**

The two tape feature is not taught in Saito et al, as the Examiner's analysis only refers to a single tape (23). Moreover, a careful review of Saito et al reveals that it does not teach, suggest or even need a second tape.

In the absence of this feature of the present invention, the claims clearly are novel over Saito. Moreover, it would not be obvious to use the second tape as the problems overcome by the present invention are not recognized in Saito et al.

**Claims 3, 4, 7 and 9**

In regard to claims 3, 4, 7 and 9, these claims would be patentable due to their dependence on claim 1 or 6.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

**Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito et al (6,782,717) in view of Shimada (6,632,547).**

Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and is patentable over Saito et al for the reasons discussed previously.

Further, the Examiner admits that Saito et al does not teach the claimed method steps for chemical strengthened glass substrates.

**Shimada**

The Examiner looks to Shimada for a teaching of a chemical strengthening (col. 4, 45-65 and throughout the patent) which is asserted to be for strengthening of a glass substrate. The Examiner notes in his analysis that the disclosed method comprises use of a tape at col. 5, lines 47-53. However, only a single tape is mentioned. Again, there is no teaching, suggestion or even identified problem related to use of a second tape. Thus, it would not have been obvious to modify the Saito et al device to provide a second tape on the basis of the teachings of Shimada, which is cited solely for strengthening of a glass substrate.

**Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito et al (6,782,717) in view of Saito et al (2003/0110803A1).**

Again, claim 5 depends from claim 1 and is patentable over Saito et al '717 for the reasons discussed previously. Further, the Examiner admits that Saito et al '717 does not teach the claimed method steps for chemical strengthened glass substrates.

**Saito et al**

The Examiner looks to Saito et al '803 for a teaching of chemical strengthened glass substrates. However, again, there is no teaching, suggestion or even identified problem related to use of a second tape. Only a single tape (30) is mentioned. Thus, it would not have been obvious to modify the Saito et al '717 device to provide a second tape on the basis of the teachings of Saito et al '803, which is cited solely for strengthening of a glass substrate.

***New Claims***

New claim 10 is added in order to define additional features of the invention, namely the size of the small foaming pores on the second tape that are used for cleaning..

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

*/Alan J. Kasper/*

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

---

Alan J. Kasper  
Registration No. 25,426

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
23373  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 3, 2008